

105.1818

111

GC/Gibson

GEORGE E. CUTLEY
COUNSELLOR AT LAW
586 NEWARK AVENUE
JERSEY CITY, N.J.

TEL. MONTGOMERY 4013-4292

Russell Watson, Esquire.

- 2 -

September 17, 1926.

of these cards that the fingerprints are the same, but I will not say that the fingerprints were made four years ago." Faurot further told Gorman that after four years time, unless the card was preserved like they do at Police Headquarters, that the chemical composition of the card and its natural tendency to disintegrate would change the contour of the fingerprints. He also said to Gorman that it had always been a serious question in his mind as to whether the procuring of fingerprints left by criminals at the scenes of the crimes are of any evidencial value because it was his experience that only when the fingerprints were taken under the most auspicious circumstances as they do at Police Headquarters, could an expert be sure of the fact that an impression had been made (parenthetically). I may say that I assume you know the preliminary requisits for taking fingerprints - the cleansing of the fingers so that all foreign substance shall be cleaned away from the cuticle, the use of lamp black,) etc. This is what I assume Faurot was referring to.

Faurot also told Gorman that there was a possibility that the fingerprints could have been taken from some other object and transferred to a card or surface and referred Gorman to an article in the American Mercury of 1925, in which this process was exposed in some incidental connection with the Sacco-Vanzetti case. I looked up this article and I find out that what he says is scientifically possible.

#2. The State in checking up the alibi of Henry Carpenter has in its possession evidence of a telephone call from New Brunswick to the home of Mr. Rice at or around ten o'clock on the night of September 15th, which my informant says has been definitely traced as coming from the home of Mrs. H. and although he says that ordinarily no records have been kept in the New Brunswick office of local calls, there was some question about this call which resulted in an unusual notation being made of its having taken place. This is from the man who did the checking up.

A man named Roche of 677 Montgomery Street, Jersey City, in the automobile tire business has in his employ a man who says that about ten years ago he knew Mrs. Gibson in South Carolina. That he knew her over a year, visited her and that although he has not seen her for a couple of years he would be willing to tell of his activities at that place. His relations with her were very intimate. He subsequently brought her to Pulatka, Florida. At that time she was known as Mrs. Latrasse and Mrs. Philopena.

I might also say that the Evening Journal is very desirous of rendering whatever publicity they can for the defense in case the defense deems it advisable that publicity should be procured. They are interested for this reason - the Mirror is owned by the family of George Harst and as you know the Evening Journal is owned by William Randolph Hearst. It is the opinion of the Evening Journal that there is no merit whatever in Mrs. Gibson's story nor in the subsequent sensational stories alleged to have been brought about as a result of the activities of the Jersey City investigators. The paper seems very much incensed against the discrimination practiced against it in regard to